

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 5, 2010 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-40 were pending in the application. Applicants amend Claim 1, 7, 9, 15, 17, 24, 27, and 28. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-40. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, 22-23 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,922,786 issued to Ong ("*Ong*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,280,540 B2 issued to Halme, et al. ("*Halme*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for several reasons, as discussed further below.

The proposed *Ong-Halme* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for tracking telecommunication services comprising:  
receiving a call packet from a first node, wherein the call packet includes a call identifier identifying a call associated with the call packet;  
determining a filter status of the call; and  
transmitting notification messages to the first node from which the call packet was received and a second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call and wherein the notification messages conform to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information; and  
forwarding the call packet to the second node.

For example, the proposed *Ong-Halme* combination fails to disclose "transmitting notification messages to the first node from which the call packet was received and a second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call and wherein the notification messages conform to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information."

The Office Action relies on *Halme*, col. 1, ll. 52-66; col. 9, 6-20; col. 11, ll. 30-56; col. 15, ll. 10-35; col. 19, ll. 55-67; col. 20, ll. 1-10; and Claim 9 in addressing a previous version of Claim 1. Office Action, p. 3. The cited portions of *Halme*, however, fail to disclose receiving transmitting a notification message to the node from which the call packet

was received. As a result, *Halme* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “transmitting notification messages to the first node from which the call packet was received” (emphasis added) of Claim 1 for at least this reason. In addition, Applicants disagree that a node of *Halme* discloses, teaches, or suggests “a first node” of Claim 1.

Moreover, the cited portions of *Halme* fail to disclose any “call,” “call identifier,” or “notification messages,” let alone “transmitting notification messages to the first node and the second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call,” as recited in amended Claim 1 (emphasis added). As a result, *Halme* fails to disclose this element of amended Claim 1 for at least this additional reason.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are therefore allowable for at least these reasons. For reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to Claim 1, Claims 7, 9, 15, 17, 24, 27, 28, and their respective dependent claims are allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1, 9, 17, and 27, and their respective dependent Claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Applicants believe that no fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: June 7, 2010

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No.

**05073**